

1
2
3
4
5
6 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
7 DISTRICT OF NEVADA

8 * * *
9 JAMIE CLARK,)
10 Plaintiff,) 3:08-cv-00158-LRH-VPC
11 v.)
12 METROPOLITAN LIFE INSURANCE)
13 COMPANY,)
14 Defendant.)
-----)

15 Before the court is defendant Metropolitan Life Insurance Company's ("MetLife") motion
16 for leave to file under seal a motion to redact portions of certain pleadings (Doc. #136) filed on
17 March 10, 2010. Doc. #135.

18 MetLife requests leave pursuant to the stipulated protective order regarding confidentiality
19 of discovery material which provides that any party that wishes to file or submit as part of the court
20 record any material subject to the protective order must first file a motion for leave to file such
21 materials under seal with the court. Doc. #65. MetLife argues that its motion refers to materials
22 deemed and designated as confidential.

23 As an initial matter, the court is acutely cognizant of the presumption in favor of public
24 access to papers filed in the district court. *See Hagestad v. Tragesser*, 49 F.3d 1430, 1434 (9th Cir.
25 1995). Therefore, a party seeking to file materials under seal bears the burden of overcoming that
26 presumption by showing that the materials are covered by an operative protective order and are also

1 deserving of confidentiality. *See Foltz v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.*, 331 F.3d 1122, 1135 (9th
2 Cir. 2005). Specifically, a party must “articulate compelling reasons supported by specific factual
3 findings that outweigh the general history of access and the public policies favoring disclosure.”
4 *Kamakana, City and County of Honolulu*, 447 F.3d 1172, 1179 (9th Cir. 2006) (internal citations
5 omitted).

6 Here, MetLife has put forth compelling reasons for sealing the requested documents.
7 MetLife has sufficiently alleged that the proposed motion refers to materials that bring attention to
8 MetLife’s confidential internal business deliberations, organization, and capabilities. *See e.g.*,
9 *Microsystems Inc. v. Network Appliance*, 2009 WL 5125817, *9, No. C-08-01641-EDL (N.D. Cal
10 2009) (finding good cause to seal documents that contain confidential business information which
11 could cause harm to the parties if publicly disclosed). Accordingly, MetLife’s motion for leave
12 shall be granted.

13 IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that defendant’s motion for leave to file under seal
14 (Doc. #135) is GRANTED.

15 IT IS SO ORDERED.

16 DATED this 16th day of March, 2010.
17



18
19 LARRY R. HICKS
20 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
21
22
23
24
25
26